

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejections raised by the Office Action and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any of the Office Action rejections not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification as including hyperlinks or other forms of browser executable code. Applicants have reviewed the specification and were unable to locate any instances of improper browser executable code. Applicants did locate numerous instances of web site URLs in the form of "(www.website.com)", but respectfully submit that such citations are proper as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 608.01 because they are not preceded by "http://" nor are they encased in brackets of the form "<www.website.com>". Rather, parentheses are used in the specification, which do not serve as an indication to a browser that the contents of the parenthesis are executable code.

Section 101 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 as nonstatutory subject matter under 35 USC § 101 as "manipulations of data wherein the result is not concrete, tangible or useful". Applicants submit that such a rejection is improper since the claimed method (i) provides a concrete and useful results in the form of inferences of physico-chemical relationships between chemical or biological molecules. Such results are concrete and tangible. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended claim 1 to explicitly refer to measurements, or "metrics", representative of inferences of physico-chemical relationships between chemical or biological molecules to address the Examiner's concerns. Support for the amendment may

be found, e.g., in the specification page 23, line 22 through page 24, line 18, and in originally filed claim 15.

Section 112 Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. The Examiner asserts that the steps of claim 1 lack sufficient detail to permit the method from being performed. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification defines and otherwise enables the performance of each step, and that each step is therefore not indefinite. For instance, the step of filtering is clearly defined in the specification, e.g., on page 20, lines 3-11 and page 25 lines 1-5. In addition, the words “extracting”, “parsing”, “filtering”, “storing”, “incrementing” are not common terms used in database technologies, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not find them to be indefinite. Thus, further details of how “parsing” is performed, or what happens if there is no relevant data to “extract” should not be required to be explicitly recited in the claim.

The remaining 112 rejections have been addressed as follows: Claim 2 has been amended to comply with a conventional method step format. Claim 4 has been amended to remove references to specific trade names. Claim 5 has been amended to clarify how the record is parsed. Claim 7 has been amended to clarify the construction of a connection network. Such connection networks are described in the specification on page 21, line 2 through page 23, line 13. Claim 10 has been amended to clarify that the cells refer to biological cells.

Section 102 Rejection

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5, and 7-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Rip et al., Scienometrics, Vol. 6, No. 6 (1984) pages 381-

400. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of Claims 1-3, 5, and 7-15 based on the foregoing amendments and the following Section 102 Remarks.

Section 102 Remarks

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are not anticipated by *Rip* because such reference does not show, describe or disclose, explicitly or inherently, the combination of elements of amended claim 1.

The preamble and body of the amended claims reflect that the automated inferences are of physico-chemical relationships, which are in turn derived from information fields that include a set of chemical or biological molecule names. *Rip et al.* does not disclose examining the information for sets of chemical or biological molecule names. The Examiner asserts that *Rip* may be customized by a user to select desired terms or keywords, however, simply because the prior art *could be* adapted to perform the claimed invention, it does not rise to the level of anticipating the recited elements. In addition, the claimed step of filtering to remove certain chemical or biological molecule names is not disclosed in *Rip et al.* Thus Applicants respectfully submit that *Rip* does not anticipate claim 1. Because the remaining claims depend from claim 1, the Applicants submit that *Rip* does not anticipate any of the claims 1-3, 5, or 7-15.

Section 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rip* in view of Chen. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of Claims 4 and 6 based on the following Section 103 Remarks.

Section 103 Remarks

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, to support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, a reference must expressly or impliedly suggest the

claimed invention. *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). The arguments from Section 102 Remarks are incorporated herein by reference. Neither the *Rip* nor *Chen* references expressly or impliedly teach or suggest all the elements of the amended claims. The Applicants submit that unlike the present claims, neither *Rip* nor *Chen*, alone or combined, teach the use of set of chemical or biological molecule names as claimed. In addition, neither *Rip* nor *Chen*, alone or combined, teach the use of filtering the chemical or biological molecule names, as claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-15 are allowable.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance, and respectfully request the Examiner to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney, at 312-913-3305.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

March 10, 2004

By:



Robert J. Irvine III
Registration No. 41,865